



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

direct offense to Japan—the country aimed at in the resolution—by putting it into general terms and thus evincing suspicion and a bit of “daring” toward the other nations with which we are supposed to be on terms of good friendship, is a very curious proceeding. The effort to save the Monroe Doctrine and revivify it in this way is doomed to wretched failure. The principles underlying the Doctrine, so far as they have any application to the conditions of our day, need no such artificial underpinning. The less that is said about them the better. A really strong man does not go about his community expressing suspicion of his neighbors and warning them to keep at a respectful distance from him.

In a third way the resolution of the Senate can scarcely fail to do harm. It is well known that the republics south of us are affected with a growing suspicion and fear of the United States, because of its frequent assertion of its intention to control the political destinies of the Western Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine to them is fast coming to mean the interference of the United States or the disposition to interfere with their independent sovereignty and their autonomy. Not even the friendly visits of two Secretaries of State have been able to convince the Latin-American countries that we have no intention of exercising or attempting to exercise political domination over them. The increasingly prosperous and powerful republics of South America,—Brazil, the Argentine Republic and Chile especially—believe that they are quite capable of looking after their own interests and are less and less inclined to be dictated to by their more powerful northern neighbor. The Monroe Doctrine means to them more and more a menace rather than a protection. The Magdalena Bay resolution cannot fail to deepen these feelings of fear and distrust. The resolution, therefore, from this point of view will almost certainly remain a dead letter, and thus bring us into deeper discredit. It is not likely that the Argentine Republic or any other of the prominent South American Republics will be in the least influenced by the Lodge resolution in dealing with any foreign commercial or industrial companies which may, for purely business purposes, wish to gain concessions on the bays or elsewhere in those countries. Things will take their natural business course, as they ought to do, and as our great and powerful country ought to wish them to do.

The Panama Canal Bill.

The Panama Canal bill, as finally adopted by both Houses of Congress, was signed by President Taft on Saturday night, August 24, and is now law.

The most objectional feature of the bill, from the international point of view—and that is the only point of view from which we consider it—was eliminated before final action upon it was taken. This was the provision in the bill in its original form that ships of citizens of the United States engaged in foreign commerce should be exempt from paying canal tolls. This provision was clearly in violation of the Hay-Pauncefote

treaty, as pointed out by the British Foreign Office, and the President had let it be known that if the bill came to him in this form he would veto it.

In its final form, however, the bill retained the provision that ships engaged exclusively in our coastwise trade shall be exempt from paying canal tolls. Two opinions are held as to the legitimacy of this feature. The President and a large majority of the Senators contend that it is not in violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The vessels of foreign nations cannot engage in our coastwise trade, and there is therefore no discrimination against their ships doing business with our shores. They are all to be treated in exactly the same way. The President is so anxious, however, that foreign nations may not be left to feel that our Government is intentionally violating the treaty and discriminating against their ships that he has proposed to Congress the passing of a resolution declaring that the measure adopted is not considered by this Government in violation of the treaty provisions regarding the canal.

A few Senators, on the other hand, hold that the plain terms of the treaty are such that the exemption of coastwise trading vessels from paying tolls is a clear violation of it, even though such exemption may not result in any direct discrimination against ships of other countries.

It is not yet known what attitude the British Government will officially take toward the bill in its final form, whether it will continue its protests or drop them. The chief ground of objection has been removed by the striking out of the provision exempting our ships engaged in foreign trade from paying tolls. The British press has in general severely arraigned the Senate and the President for the action taken, charging that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty has been deliberately ignored and that our Government has narrowly and selfishly shown a disposition to cripple British trade and that of other countries at the canal as much as possible. These charges will doubtless be modified or dropped when the real nature of the canal legislation is better understood. The British Government will certainly not take officially any such extreme ground. But if that government shall still put forward the contention that the canal legislation as approved by the President violates the evident intent and purpose of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, then we shall be asked to refer the question to the Hague Court, and to the Hague Court it will go. The outcome will be sensible and peaceful, and there will be no serious disturbance, resulting from the difference, of the good relations which have so long existed between us and our British friends on the other side of the sea.

Since the above was written the British Government has reaffirmed its protest against the Panama Canal bill. In a note filed with the State Department on August 28 by A. Mitchell Innes, chargé of the British Embassy in Washington, it was stated that if a satisfactory agreement cannot be reached through direct negotiation Great Britain will ask that the question be arbitrated by the Hague Court. In the note it was stated that the British government would give careful consideration to the Canal bill and also to the special memorandum sent to the Senate by the President accompanying his approval of the bill. There will be further negotiation on the subject, and it is probable that a satisfactory agreement will soon be reached.

Only One New Battleship.

The final outcome of the battleship contest in Congress, which was watched with so much interest throughout the country, was the agreement of the two Houses last month, just before adjournment, to make appropriation for one new ship of the Dreadnaught type, and for only one, the new monster to cost not more than \$15,000,000. All the efforts of the Senate and of the big-navy men in the House to force through the provision for an increase of the navy by two huge fighting craft failed.

We have been glad to know that the opposition in Congress to further naval increase has not been by any means all "politics," as has been quite generally supposed. Many men in the House and a few in the Senate hold, and have held for several years, regardless of political affiliations, that there is no reason why the navy should be increased by any more units at the present time. They still hold this view, though they have accepted the compromise on one ship in order to break the deadlock and not have the whole navy bill go by default.

We regard the limitation of naval increase to one battleship as a very substantial gain in the direction of sanity and economic sense. If this limitation can be maintained hereafter, as it seems probable will be the case, in spite of frantic efforts which will be made to restore the two-ship program, it means that the growth of the navy, at least in number of battleships, has actually ceased, for one new ship built each year will only just replace an old one going out of commission.

The action of Congress in this direction represents, we believe, the prevailing sentiment of the people of the country, who have been waking up very rapidly the last three or four years to the absurdity and wickedness of the United States, situated as it is and making such high professions of peace leadership among the nations, plunging recklessly deeper and deeper into the spirit of the armament rivalry of the Old World. The check

has come none too soon to suit the toiling masses of the people, on whom the burdens of war and war preparations bear most heavily.

Some members of Congress and various citizens of the country are crying out that this limitation of the navy will reduce us to fifth in rank among the naval powers and put us at the mercy of other countries. But why should we not be willing to be fifth in rank, or even lower than that, since our national honor, our highest interests, and our mission to the world lie in an entirely different direction from that of supremacy in brute force and instruments of death? Time will show that we shall be just as safe building one new Dreadnaught a year as if we built four—indeed, safer, and much more honored and respected and *followed*. The end of the consuming naval rivalry of our day, which has just now burst out with new fury between Germany and Great Britain, must come soon, in one way or another, and the time is not far away when the American people will boast of it as among their supremest honors that they took the first step leading to the peaceful removal of this huge barrier to the further economic, social, and moral progress of the world.

Dr. Eliot Home from the East.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard University, arrived at San Francisco on August 5 from his peace journey around the world. He went on a voyage of inquiry, under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, to study the conditions in the Eastern countries with a view of trying to find out how the Endowment, of whose board of trustees he is one, may operate most successfully in promoting interest in world peace in those lands. He has been gone about nine months, having sailed from New York on November 2, 1911. He has given lectures on the proposed work of the Carnegie Endowment in the large cities of China and Japan, has visited and made inquiries of many prominent men, diplomats, bankers, scholars, priests, royal personages, etc. The results of his inquiries and observations will be put into a comprehensive report which he will make at an early date to the trustees of the Endowment. He has gone for the present to his summer home at Mount Desert Island, Maine, where he will rest and prepare his report.

It is not possible at this time to give any complete statement of the conclusions which Dr. Eliot has reached. But what he has said in lectures, in interviews, etc., during the trip and since he returned gives a pretty clear indication of what he will say.

We notice first of all that he brings word that the whole Orient appears to be in accord with the peace movement. Instead of secretly planning to make war on the United States, he found Japanese statesmen be-